

1 MICHAEL A. JACOBS (CA SBN 111664)
MJacobs@mofo.com
2 ARTURO J. GONZALEZ (CA SBN 121490)
AGonzalez@mofo.com
3 ERIC A. TATE (CA SBN 178719)
ETate@mofo.com
4 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
425 Market Street
5 San Francisco, California 94105-2482
Telephone: 415.268.7000
6 Facsimile: 415.268.7522

7 KAREN L. DUNN (*Pro Hac Vice* app. pending)
kdunn@bsflp.com
8 HAMISH P.M. HUME (*Pro Hac Vice* app. pending)
hhume@bsflp.com
9 BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
1401 New York Avenue, N.W.
10 Washington DC 20005
Telephone: 202.237.2727
11 Facsimile: 202.237.6131

12 Attorneys for Defendants
UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
13 OTTOMOTTO LLC, and OTTO TRUCKING LLC

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
16 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

17 WAYMO LLC,
18 Plaintiff,
19 v.
20 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
21 OTTOMOTTO LLC; OTTO TRUCKING LLC,
22 Defendants.

Case No. 3:17-cv-00939-WHA

**UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
OTTOMOTTO LLC, AND OTTO
TRUCKING LLC'S
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO
SHORTEN TIME FOR HEARING ON
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO
COMPEL ARBITRATION**

Complaint Filed: February 23, 2017
First Am. Compl. Filed: March 10, 2017
Trial Date: October 2, 2017

1 As the Court knows, a preliminary injunction hearing in this matter is scheduled for
2 May 4, 2017. At the case management conference, on March 16, 2017, counsel for Uber advised
3 the Court that it would be filing a petition to compel arbitration on the basis that Google's
4 employment agreements contain very broad arbitration provisions. This Court then stated: "I
5 don't want to go through the pain and suffering of a preliminary injunction hearing if it has to be
6 arbitrated, is the point. Think that through." (González Decl. Ex. A at 15:12-14.)

7 Today, Uber is filing a Motion to Compel Arbitration of, and to Stay, Trade Secrets and
8 UCL Claims ("Motion"), and will set it for hearing on May 4, the same date as the preliminary
9 injunction. By this motion, Defendants ask that the Court set the following schedule for the
10 Motion to Compel Arbitration:

- 11 • Waymo's Opposition to the Motion: **April 3, 2017:**
- 12 • Defendants' Reply In Support of Their Motion: **April 6, 2017**
- 13 • Hearing on the Motion: **April 13, 2017**

14 This proposed schedule would have the Court consider this Motion three weeks before the
15 hearing on preliminary injunction. Plaintiff has advised us that it opposes this request on the
16 basis that even if this motion is granted, there will still be a hearing on its motion for preliminary
17 injunction pertaining to the four patent claims at issue. (González Decl. ¶ 3, Ex. B.) That may
18 be true, but that would be a very different hearing.

19 Dated: March 27, 2017

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

20
21 By: /s/ Arturo J. González
ARTURO J. GONZÁLEZ

22 Attorneys for Defendants
23 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
24 OTTOMOTTO LLC, and OTTO TRUCKING LLC
25
26
27
28